APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/823,123	03/25/97	HUMES	D C/P4128US0

```
    000881                          LM01/1125
LARSON AND TAYLOR
1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET
SUITE 900
ALEXANDRIA VA 22314
```

EXAMINER
WINDER, P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2758	8

DATE MAILED: 11/25/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/823,123	Applicant(s) Humes
Examiner Patrice L. Winder	Group Art Unit 2758

[X] Responsive to communication(s) filed on *Mar 25, 1997* _____ .

[ ] This action is **FINAL**.

[ ] Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire ___3___ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

[X] Claim(s) *1-20* _____ is/are pending in the application.

    Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

[ ] Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

[X] Claim(s) *1-20* _____ is/are rejected.

[ ] Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

[ ] Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

[X] See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

[ ] The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

[ ] The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is [ ] approved [ ] disapproved.

[ ] The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

[ ] The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

[ ] Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

    [ ] All [ ] Some* [ ] None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

        [ ] received.

        [ ] received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____ .

        [ ] received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    *Certified copies not received: _____ .

[ ] Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

[X] Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

[X] Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). ___2___

[ ] Interview Summary, PTO-413

[X] Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 *(Substitute)*

[ ] Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for

examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3.   Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Cragun et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,832,212 (hereafter referred to as Cragun).

4.   As to claim 1, Cragun taught a computer readable memory containing a computer

program for programming a general purpose computer to perform a method for filtering a block

of text data containing words received over a network (censoring browser method and apparatus

for Internet viewing), wherein said method comprises the steps of:

a) providing a listing of target words (a list of censored word list, col. 4, lines 43-45);

b) comparing each word in said block of text data to said listing to determine any word in

said block of text data which matched one of said target words in said listing (check the words in

the current packet, col. 6, lines 11-16); and

c) replacing at least one word in said block of text data which matches one of said target

words in said listing with a replacement-word to provide a new block of text data (col. 6, lines

54-59).

5.   As to dependent claim 2, Cragun taught further comprising: providing a respective

replace-variable associated with each of said target words in said listing, each said replace variable

being set to either a true state or a false state (substitution = true, col. 6, lines 54-59); and

replacing each said word in said block of text data that matches one of said target words

in said listing having its respective replace-variable set to a true state with a replacement-word to

provide a new block of text data (col. 6, lines 54-62).

6.   As to dependent claim 3, further comprising:

providing a respective score-variable associated with each of said target words in said

listing, each said score-variable having a numerical value (category field 706, Figure 7, col. 8,

lines 10-12, 12-15);

determining a total score for said block of text data based on the respective score-variable

associated with each word in said block of text data which matches one of said target words in

said listing (calculating master tally, Figures 10A, 10B, 10C, col. 9); and

replacing said new block of text data with a substitute block of data if said total score for

said block of text data exceeds a predetermined numerical threshold (col. 4, lines 58-63).

7.   As to dependent claim 4, a computer readable memory as in claim 3, further comprising

providing a respective bonus score-variable associated with each of said target words in said

listing, each said bonus score-variable having a numerical value (weight change 708, col. 8, lines

2-5), wherein said total score for said block of text data is determined based also on the respective

bonus score-variable associated with at least one word in said block of text data which matches

one of said target words in said listing (col. 8, lines 50-52).

8.   As to claims 6-9, they differ from claims 1-4 by substituting the language which discloses

a computer based method rather than a method of a computer program resident in a general

purpose computer. Therefore, claims 6-9 are rejected on the same rationale as claims 1-4,

respectively.

9.   As to claims 13-16, they differ from claims 1-4 by the arrangement of elements of a

method of a computer program resident in a general purpose computer. Therefore, claims 13-16

are rejected on the same rationale as claims 1-4, respectively.

10.   As to claim 18, Cragun taught a computer based method for filtering a block of text

containing words received over a network, said method comprising the steps of:

        a) providing a listing of target words (col. 4, lines 42-45);

        b) providing a respective-category variable associated with each of said target words in

said listing for expressing a category of with which each of said target words in said listing is

associated (category index, col. 8, lines 2-5, 12-15);

        c) comparing each word in said block of text to said listing to determine any word in said

block of text which matches one of said target words in said listing (col. 6, lines 11-16); and

d) providing an output comprising a record of the respective categories with which each

target word in said listing which matches a word in said block of text data is associated (Figure

14, col. 3, lines 23-26).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

12.   Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Camaisa et

al., U.S. Patent No. 5,784,564 (hereafter referred to as Camaisa).

13.   As to claim 11, Camaisa taught computer based method for filtering a web page received

over the World Wide Web and providing an output, said web page having a header portion, a

body portion and an associated requested URL (closed browser for computer and computer

network), said method comprising the steps of:

a) providing an allow-list of URLs associated with approved web pages (closed browser

array 37A, col. 5, lines 14-18);

b) providing a deny-list of URLs associated with disapproved web pages (closed link array

37B, col. 5, lines 29-36);

d) comparing said requested URL with said URLs in said allow-list, and if said requested URL matches any of said URLs in said allow-list, providing the web page as an output (claim 7);

e) if said requested URL does not match any of said URLs in said allow-list, comparing said requested URL with said URLs in said deny-list, and, if said requested URL matches any of said URLs in said deny-list, providing an output indicating access to the web page is forbidden (claim 7);

Camaisa does not specifically teach c) providing a listing of target words; and if said requested URL does not match any of said URLs in said deny-list providing a computer based filter. However, Cragun taught c) providing a listing of target words (censor word list, col. 6, lines 11-16) and f) a computer based filter for comparing each word in the header of the web page to said listing to determine any word in the header of the web page which matches one of said target words in said listing (col. 4, lines 42-50); and

g) providing an indication that access to the web page is forbidden or a modified version of the web page as an output if a word in the header of the web page matches one of said target words in said listing (col. 3, lines 54-62). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Cragun's browser censor in Camaisa's closed browser because doing so would have improved effectiveness by ensuring the sites viewed do not contain objectionable material. The motivation would have been to provide content based filtering as well (Cragun, col. 2, lines 4-12).

14.   As to dependent claim 12, Cragun taught further comprising providing a computer based

filter for comparing each word in the body of the web page to said listing to determine any word

in the body of the web page which matches one of said target words in said listing (col. 6, lines

11-16); and

        providing an indication that access to the web page is forbidden or a modified version of

the web page as an output if a word in the body of the web page matches one of said target words

in said listing (col. 3, lines 54-62). The motivation is the same as paragraph number 14.

15.   Claims 5, 10, 17, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Cragun.

16.   As to dependent claims 5, 10 and 17, Cragun does not specifically teach wherein said

total score for said block of text data is determined based also on the proximity of each word in

said block of text data which matches one of said target words in said listing to said target words

in said listing. Cragun taught wherein said total score for said block of text data is determined

based also on the context of each word in said block of text data which matches one of said target

words in said listing (col. 9, lines 15-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating a total score based on proximity in

for Cragun's total score based on context would have provided a more thorough method of

determining context. The motivation would have been to decrease complexity, while providing a

thorough method of determining context.

17.   As to dependent claim 19, Cragun taught further comprising:

providing a respective score-variable associated with each of said target words in said

listing, each of said score-variable having a numerical value (case weight 810, col. 8, lines 21-26);

determining a total category score for said block of text data based on the respective

score-variable and category-variable associated with each word in said block of text which

matches one of said target words in said listing (col. 8, lines 50-52); and

providing said total category score for each category in a memory (col. 10, lines 9-14).

Cragun does not specifically teach providing the total category score in said output. However,

displaying generated information as an output is well known in the art. It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that incorporating

displaying an output in Cragun's censoring method would have improved utility by giving the user

a more personalized output. The motivation would have been because displaying an output is well

known in the art.

18.   As to dependent claim 20, Cragun taught replacing said block of text with a substitute

block of data if said total category score for a category exceeds a predetermined threshold (col. 6,

lines 54-62).

Conclusion

19.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

        a.   Schloss, U.S. Patent No. 5,706,507: taught a system and method for controlling

access to data located on a content server;

        b.   Cohen, U.S. Patent No. 5,796,948: taught an offensive message interceptor for

installation on computer mail systems; and

        c.   Bradshaw et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,835,722: taught a system to control content

and prohibit certain interactive attempts by a person using a personal computer;

20.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Patrice Winder whose telephone number is (703) 305-3938. The examiner

can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Parsh Lall, can be reached on (703) 305-9715. The fax phone number for this Group is (703)

308-9052.

        Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

RICHARD L. ELLIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Plw

November 22, 1998